

REMARKS

Claims 1, 8, 14 and 15 have been amended. Claim 7 has been canceled. Reexamination and reconsideration of pending claims 1-4, 8-12, 14-17 and 20-21 are respectfully requested.

In view of the Final Office Action dated August 7, 2009, this Reply is being submitted together with a Request for Continued Examination.

I. Formalities

Applicant thanks the Examiner for withdrawing the prior objections to the priority document and Information Disclosure Statement. Applicant also thanks the Examiner for withdrawing the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejections.

II. Prior Art Rejections

In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 7-10, 14-17 and 20-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Nakano et al. (EP 1 134 674) in view of Rutledge et al. (US 6,650,998). Further, claims 11-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Nakano et al. in view of Rutledge et al. and further in view of Wilson et al. (US 6,985,929). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections in view of the following remarks.

A. Claim 1

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the new rejection of independent claim 1 based on Nakano et al. in view of Rutledge et al. In that regard, Applicant incorporates its prior remarks set forth in the Reply filed November 25, 2008. Additionally, while Applicant respectfully submits no amendment to claim 1 is necessary to define over Nakano et al. in view of Rutledge et al., Applicant has nonetheless incorporated the feature of dependent claim 7 in order to further clarify claim 1. Support for this amendment can be found, *inter alia*, in the specification at page 29, line 11 – page 30, line 2, and in original claim 7.

Applicant's amended claim 1 thus recites a map data processing apparatus comprising, *inter alia*, a plurality of levels, each corresponding to one of a plurality of different scaling factors at which a map is rendered, as well as a plurality of sets of map-related information provided in correspondence to the plurality of levels. The map-related information is provided in units of individual divisions, "at least one type of map-related information available at all levels" and "another type of map-related information available at one or more specific levels but not all levels." The one type and the other type of map-related information are provided separately from each other. The incorporated feature of dependent claim 7 makes clear that the one type of map-related information is

used to display the map at a display device, and the other type of map-related information contains information used in route search.

The Office Action maintains that the claimed feature of “at least one type of map-related information available at all levels” is disclosed in Nakano et al. in numbered paragraph [0078] and Figures 7 and 8(a). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The recited passage of Nakano et al. discussed by the Examiner only discloses that a single (one) cartographic file CF comprises the background data composed of a basic background table and a detailed background table (see the single file CF of Figure 7). Applicant’s claim language, however, requires “at least one type of map-related information available at all levels.” As amended, this “one type of map-related information” is used to display the map at a display device. Nowhere does Nakano et al. disclose or suggest that its background data are available at all levels.

Next, the Office Action maintains that the claimed feature of “another type of map-related information available at one or more specific levels but not all levels”, wherein the other type of map-related information is provided separately from the one type of map-related information, is disclosed in paragraph [0098] and Figures 7 and 23(a) of Nakano et al. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The passages cited by the Examiner disclose only that one cartographic file CF comprises the character/symbol data including a basic character/symbol table and a detailed character/symbol table. Nowhere does Nakano et al. disclose or suggest that such character/symbol data are available at one or more specific levels but not all levels.

In that regard, Nakano's Figures 8(a), 8(b) and 8(c), as well as Figures 23(a), 23(b) and 23(c) only show the basic table, the detailed table, and the combination of the basic and detailed tables. These figures do not show a plurality of levels that are defined, each in correspondence to one of a plurality of difference scaling factors at which the map is rendered. To emphasize the point, Figures 8 and 23 only show the map having a single scale, as clearly shown in the figures, and do not relate to the concept of levels at all, as such levels are defined in claim 1 and in Applicant's specification. Indeed, reference to "levels" relating to "scales" are described in paragraphs [0051] – [0060] of Nakano et al. Of course, Nakano's disclosure of levels does not at all describe or suggest Applicant's claimed feature wherein

"as the map-related information provided in units of the individual divisions, at least one type of map-related information available at all levels and another type of map-related information available at one or more specific levels but not all levels are provided separately from each other"

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits claim 1 is patentable over Nakano, whether alone or in combination with Rutledge.

Further, claims 2-4 and 20-21 depend from claim 1 and are also submitted to be patentable over the art of record.

B. Claim 8

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claim 8. Applicant incorporates its prior remarks from the Reply filed November 25, 2008. While Applicant respectfully submits no amendments with respect to claim 8 are necessary to define over the art of record, Applicant has nonetheless amended claim 8 to provide further clarification. Support for the amendments can be found in the specification at page 55, line 7 – page 60, line 22.

Applicant's amended independent claim 8 recites a map data processing apparatus comprising, *inter alia*, a connecting point at which the map-related information corresponding to one of two divisions is correlated to the map-related information corresponding to the other division present at a geographically matching position within the two divisions, the two divisions respectively belonging to levels different from each other. Sets of information related to the connecting point contain common two-dimensional coordinate values indicating the position of the connecting point within the map in the map-related information corresponding to the two divisions. Two-dimensional coordinate values of the connecting point at a given level further contains two-dimensional

coordinate values of the connecting point at a level at which the map is rendered in greater detail than the given level.

In the Office Action, the Examiner maintains that the features of claim 8 are recited in Nakano at paragraphs [0180] – [0181]. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

While Nakano may disclose a problem due to rounding error in [0180], Nakano's disclosed solution in [0181] is completely different from Applicant's invention recited in claim 8. Nakano discloses only that "the node records NR are recorded in the ascending orders of coordinates on the basis of the normalized longitude/latitude coordinates which do not contain the rounding errors" (see paragraph [0181]). Nowhere, however, does Nakano disclose or suggest Applicant's claimed feature wherein the "two-dimensional coordinate values of the connection point at a given level further contains two-dimensional coordinate values of the connecting point at a level at which the map is rendered in greater detail than the given level."

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits claim 8 is patentable over Nakano, whether taken alone or in combination with Rutledge. Further, claims 9-12 depend from claim 8 and are also submitted to be patentable over the art of record.

C. Claim 14

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of independent claim 14. In that regard, Applicant incorporates its prior remarks from the Reply filed November 25, 2008. While Applicant submits no amendment of claim 14 is necessary to define over the art of record, Applicant has nonetheless amended claim 14 to provide further clarification. Support for the amendment can be found in the specification at page 30, line 2 – page 31, line 2.

Applicant's amended independent claim 14 recites a map data processing apparatus comprising, *inter alia*, map-related information having a highest priority among different types of map-related information prepared in order not to exceed a predetermined upper data size limit. The processing unit executes processing of the map data by using the map-related information provided in units of individual divisions where the map-related information having the highest priority among the different types of map-related information is prepared in order not to exceed the predetermined upper data size limit.

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Rutledge discloses the feature of claim 14 at column 5, lines 6-13. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The passage noted by the Examiner in Rutledge discloses only that:

Likewise, overlay 220, corresponding to parks, may comprise many park overlays, with parks in each overlay categorized on the basis of size. For example, large state parks may be stored

in one overlay, and smaller city and neighborhood parks may be stored in another overlay.

The above passage does not disclose and teach the feature of “map-related information having the highest priority among the different types of map-related information is prepared in order not to exceed a predetermined upper data size limit” in accordance with Applicant’s amended claim 14. Indeed, Rutledge does not disclose “data size”, but rather only the size of a park, wherein presumably a state park would be larger than a city park. This has nothing to do with Applicant’s invention.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits independent claim 14 is patentable over the art of record. Further, claims 15-17 depend from claim 14 and are also submitted to be patentable over the art of record.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits all pending claims are now in condition for allowance. An early notice to that effect is solicited.


If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

Serial No. 10/514,423
Amendment Dated: January 7, 2010
Reply to Final Office Action Mailed: August 7, 2009
Attorney Docket No. 029267.55611US

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket # 029267.55611US).

Respectfully submitted,

January 7, 2010


Jeffrey D. Sanok
Registration No. 32,169

CROWELL & MORING LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
JDS:njr
dn#10016268_1